arXiv:1101.1166v1 [math.AG] 6 Jan 2011

LOG CANONICAL MODELS FOR THE MODULI SPACE OF POINTED STABLE RATIONAL CURVES

HAN-BOM MOON

ABSTRACT. We run Mori's program for the moduli space of pointed stable rational curves with divisor $K + \sum a_i\psi_i$. We prove that, without assuming the F-conjecture, the birational model for the pair is the Hassett's moduli space of weighted pointed stable rational curves, without any modification of weight coefficients.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Knudsen-Mumford space $\overline{M}_{0,n}$, or the moduli space of pointed stable rational curves is one of the most concrete and well-studied moduli spaces in algebraic geometry. For example, it is well-known that $\overline{M}_{0,n}$ is a smooth projective fine moduli space ([Ke92, Knu83]). Also the cohomology ring, the Chow ring and the Picard group are known ([Ke92]). There are several concrete constructions by using explicit methods such as smooth blow-ups ([Kap93, Ke92]) or by geometric invariant theory (GIT) as quotients by a small dimensional algebraic group ([HK00, KM10]). Futhermore, there are various different compactifications of the space of smooth pointed rational curves such as Hassett's moduli spaces of weighted pointed stable rational curves $\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}$ ([Has03]), the GIT quotients of the product of the projective lines ([Kap93]) and the moduli spaces of pointed conics ([GS10]). All of these are birational models of $\overline{M}_{0,n}$.

In spite of these numerous achievements, the birational geometric aspects of $\overline{M}_{0,n}$ are not fully understood yet. For instance, the Mori cone $\overline{NE}_1(\overline{M}_{0,n})$ (dually, the nef cone $\mathrm{Nef}(\overline{M}_{0,n})$) is unknown. There is a conjectural description of this cone which is proved for $n \le 7$ ([KMc96]).

Conjecture 1.1 (F-conjecture). *Any effective curve in $\overline{M}_{0,n}$ is numerically equivalent to a nonnegative linear combination of vital curves. In other words, every extremal ray of $\overline{NE}_1(\overline{M}_{0,n})$ is generated by vital curve classes.*

Recently, there has been a tremendous amount of interest in the birational geometry of $\overline{M}_{0,n}$ ([AS08, Fed10, FS08, GS10, Has03, HK00, Kap93, Sim07]) and more generally of $\overline{M}_{g,n}$. In particular, one can run Mori's program (or the minimal model program) for $\overline{M}_{0,n}$ with a big $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor D of $\overline{M}_{0,n}$, by finding a birational model

$$\overline{M}_{0,n}(D) := \mathrm{Proj}\left(\bigoplus_{l\ge 0} H^0(\overline{M}_{0,n}, \mathcal{O}(lD))\right) \tag{1}$$

Date: January, 2011.

where the sum is taken over l sufficiently divisible, and giving a moduli theoretic description to this birational model.

The most prominent two results in this direction are the following. Set $m = \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$. Let ϵ_k be a rational number in the range $\frac{1}{m+1-k} < \epsilon_k \leq \frac{1}{m-k}$ for $k = 1, 2, \cdots, m-2$. For $\epsilon > 0$, let $n \cdot \epsilon = (\epsilon, \cdots, \epsilon)$ be a *symmetric* weight datum.

Theorem 1.2 (Simpson [AS08, FS08, KM10, Sim07]). *Let β be a rational number satisfying $\frac{2}{n-1} < \beta \leq 1$ and let $D = \overline{M}_{0,n} - M_{0,n}$ denote the total boundary divisor. Then the* log canonical model

$$\overline{M}_{0,n}(K_{\overline{M}_{0,n}} + \beta D) = \mathrm{Proj}\left(\bigoplus_{l \geq 0} H^0(\overline{M}_{0,n}, \mathcal{O}(l(K_{\overline{M}_{0,n}} + \beta D)))\right) \tag{2}$$

satisfies the following:

(1) *If $\frac{2}{m-k+2} < \beta \leq \frac{2}{m-k+1}$ for $1 \leq k \leq m-2$, then $\overline{M}_{0,n}(K_{\overline{M}_{0,n}} + \beta D) \cong \overline{M}_{0,n\cdot\epsilon_k}$.*
(2) *If $\frac{2}{n-1} < \beta \leq \frac{2}{m+1}$, then $\overline{M}_{0,n}(K_{\overline{M}_{0,n}} + \beta D) \cong (\mathbb{P}^1)^n /\!/ SL(2)$ where the quotient is taken with respect to the symmetric linearization $\mathcal{O}(1, \cdots, 1)$.*

The other result concerned *non-symmetric* weights and higher genera is the following theorem of Fedorchuk. It is an answer to the question of Hassett ([Has03, Problem 7.1]).

Theorem 1.3. [Fed10] *For every genus g and weight datum $\mathcal{A}$, there exists a* log canonical divisor *$D_{g,\mathcal{A}}$ on $\overline{M}_{g,n}$ such that the log canonical model $\overline{M}_{g,n}(K_{\overline{M}_{g,n}} + D_{g,\mathcal{A}})$ is isomorphic to $\overline{M}_{g,\mathcal{A}}$.*

Very recently, in [Mo10], the author finds an *universal* formula generalizing Theorem 1.2 to non-symmetric weights $\mathcal{A} = (a_1, a_2, \cdots, a_n)$, and proves it with assuming the F-conjecture.

Theorem 1.4. *Let $\mathcal{A} = (a_1, a_2, \cdots, a_n)$ be a weight datum. Then the log canonical model $\overline{M}_{0,n}(K_{\overline{M}_{0,n}} + \sum_{i=1}^n a_i\psi_i)$ is isomorphic to $\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}$.*

The aim of this paper is proving Theorem 1.4 *without assuming the F-conjecture.*

Here is an outline of the proof. Let $\Delta_{\mathcal{A}} = K_{\overline{M}_{0,n}} + \sum_{i=1}^n a_i\psi_i$. Let $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}} : \overline{M}_{0,n} \to \overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}$ be the reduction morphism. By computing the push-forwards and pull-backs of divisors (See Section 2.2.), we prove that $\Delta_{\mathcal{A}} - \varphi_{\mathcal{A}}^*\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}})$ is an effective divisor supported on the exceptional locus of $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}}$. Thus

$$H^0(\overline{M}_{0,n}, \mathcal{O}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}})) \cong H^0(\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}, \mathcal{O}(\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}})))$$

by [Deb01, Lemma 7.11]. Hence if we prove that $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}})$ is ample on $\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{M}_{0,n}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}}) &= \mathrm{Proj}\left(\bigoplus_{l\geq 0} H^0(\overline{M}_{0,n}, \mathcal{O}(l\Delta_{\mathcal{A}}))\right)\\ &\cong \mathrm{Proj}\left(\bigoplus_{l\geq 0} H^0(\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}, \mathcal{O}(l\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}})))\right) \cong \overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}.\end{aligned}$$

For proving the ampleness of $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}})$, we follow the strategy of Fedorchuk in [Fed10]. Firstly, we can express $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}})$ in terms of tautological divisors on $\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}$. Then by using a positivity result of Fedorchuk (Proposition 3.3) and the induction on the dimension, we prove that $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}})$ intersects non-negatively with all irreducible curves on $\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}$, so is nef. Moreover, we proved that small perturbations of $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}})$ by boundary divisors are again nef. Since the Neron-Severi vector space $N^1(\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}})$ is generated by the boundary divisor classes, this implies that $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}})$ lying on the interior of $\mathrm{Nef}(\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}})$, so it is ample by Kleiman's criterion.

For boundary weight cases, Kapranov's morphism $\pi_{\mathcal{A}} : \overline{M}_{0,n} \to (\mathbb{P}^1)^n//SL(2)$ plays the same role of the reduction morphism. By the similar strategy, we prove the following theorem in [Mo10].

Theorem 1.5. [Mo10] *Let $\mathcal{A} = (a_1, \cdots, a_n)$ be a boundary weight data, i.e., $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i = 2$. Then the log canonical model $\overline{M}_{0,n}(K_{\overline{M}_{0,n}} + \sum_{i=1}^n a_i\psi_i)$ is isomorphic to $(\mathbb{P}^1)^n//_L SL(2)$. where L is the linearization $\mathcal{O}(a_1, \cdots, a_n)$.*

By direct computation, it is easy to see that item (1) of Theorem 1.2 is a special case of Theorem 1.4 (see Remark 3.8). Also, we can regard item (2) of Theorem 1.2 as a special case of Theorem 1.5.

It is well known that the dimension of the Neron-Severi vector space $N^1(\overline{M}_{0,n})$ is $2^{n-1} - \binom{n}{2} - 1$ ([Ke92]). But by Theorem 1.4, to get Hassett's spaces $\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}$, it suffices to run Mori's program for an n-dimensional subcone of $N^1(\overline{M}_{0,n})$ only. So we can guess that there are huge unknown families of birational models of $\overline{M}_{0,n}$ other than Hassett's moduli spaces.

This paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we give some known facts about $\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}$ and its divisor classes. Essentially there is no new result in this section. In section 3, we give a proof of Theorem 1.4.

Acknowledgement. It is a great pleasure to thank my advisor Young-Hoon Kiem. Originally finding an universal formula for log canonical models of $\overline{M}_{0,n}$ is a question raised by him. Without his patience and advice, it is impossible to finish this project. I would also like to thank Maksym Fedorchuck for invaluable discussions and comments.

2. SOME PRELIMINARIES

2.1. **Moduli space of weighted pointed rational stable curves.** A *weight datum* $\mathcal{A} = (a_1, a_2, \cdots, a_n)$ is a sequence of rational numbers such that $0 < a_i \leq 1$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i > 2$. A family of rational curves with n marked points over a base scheme B consists of a flat proper morphism $\pi : C \to B$ whose geometric fibers are nodal connected rational curves, and n sections $s_1, s_2, \cdots, s_n$ of π.

Definition 2.1. [Has03, Section 2] A family of rational curves with n marked points $\pi : (C, s_1, \cdots, s_n) \to B$ is *$\mathcal{A}$-stable* if

(1) the sections $s_1, \cdots, s_n$ lie in the smooth locus of π;

(2) for any subset $\{s_{i_1}, \cdots, s_{i_r}\}$ of nonempty intersection, $a_{i_1} + \cdots + a_{i_r} \le 1$;
(3) $\omega_\pi + \sum a_i s_i$ is π-ample.

For any weight data $\mathcal{A}$, there exists a connected projective smooth moduli space $\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}$ ([Has03, Theorem 2.1]). Note that when $a_1 = \cdots = a_n = 1$, $\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}} = \overline{M}_{0,n}$.

Let $\mathcal{A} = (a_1, \cdots, a_n)$, $\mathcal{B} = (b_1, \cdots, b_n)$ be two weight data and suppose that $a_i \ge b_i$ for all $i = 1, 2, \cdots, n$. Then there exists a birational *reduction morphism* ([Has03, Theorem 4.1])

$$\varphi_{\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}} : \overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}} \to \overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{B}}.$$

For $(C, s_1, \cdots, s_n) \in \overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}$, $\varphi_{\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}}(C, s_1, \cdots, s_n)$ is obtained by collapsing components on which $\omega_C + \sum b_i s_i$ fails to be ample. Every reduction morphism is a divisorial contraction.

In this article, we use reduction morphisms from $\overline{M}_{0,n}$ only. So we use more concise notation

$$\varphi_{\mathcal{A}} := \varphi_{(1,\cdots,1),\mathcal{A}} : \overline{M}_{0,n} \to \overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}.$$

It is a composition of blow-ups along smooth subvarieties ([KM10, Mo11]).

2.2. **Tautological divisors on $\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}$.**

In this section, we recall some information about several functorial divisors on $\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}$. Most of results in this section are spread on many literatures for instance [AC96, AC99, Fed10, FS08, HM98, Has03]. Some of results are simple generalization or modification of them.

Let $[n] = \{1, 2, \cdots, n\}$. For $I \subset [n]$ such that $2 \le |I| \le n-2$, let $D_I \subset \overline{M}_{0,n}$ be the closure of the locus of curves C with two irreducible components C_I, C_{I^c} such that i-th marked point lying on C_I if and only if $i \in I$. So $D_I = D_{I^c}$. These divisors are called *boundary divisors*. By [Ke92], boundary divisors generate the Picard group $\mathrm{Pic}(\overline{M}_{0,n})$ and Neron-Severi vector space $N^1(\overline{M}_{0,n})$.

Let $\mathcal{A} = (a_1, a_2, \cdots, a_n)$ be a weight datum. For $I \subset [n]$, let $w_I := \sum_{i \in I} a_i$. There are two kinds of boundary divisor classes in $\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}$ for a general weight datum $\mathcal{A}$.

(1) *Boundary of nodal curves*: Suppose that $w_{I^c} \ge w_I > 1$. Let D_I be the divisor of $\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}$ corresponding the closure of the locus of curves with two irreducible components C_I, C_{I^c} and $s_i \in C_I$ if and only if $i \in I$. Let D_{nod} be the sum of all boundaries of nodal curves.
(2) *Boundary of curves with coincident sections*: Suppose that $I = \{i, j\}$ and $w_I \le 1$. Since $w = w_{[n]} > 2$, this implies $w_{I^c} > w_I$ automatically. Let D_I be the locus of $s_i = s_j$. Let D_{sec} be the sum of all boundaries of curves with coincident sections.

Since the reduction morphism $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a composition of smooth blow-ups, one can easily derive following push-forward and pull-back formulas for divisor classes.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}} : \overline{M}_{0,n} \to \overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}$ be the reduction morphism. For $I \subset [n]$, let $w_I = \sum_{i \in I} a_i$. Assume $w_I \le w_{I^c}$ for every D_I.*

(1) $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(D_I) = \begin{cases} 0, & |I| \ge 3 \text{ and } w_i \le 1 \\ D_I, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$

(2) $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}}^*(D_I) = \begin{cases} D_I + \sum_{J \supset I, w_J \le 1} D_J, & D_I \textit{ is a boundary of curves with coincident sections} \\ D_I, & \textit{otherwise.} \end{cases}$

Let $\pi : U \to \overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}$ be the universal curve and $\sigma_i : \overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}} \to U$ for $i = 1, \cdots, n$ be the unversal sections. Let $\omega = \omega_{U/\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}}$ be the relative dualizing bundle. Then we can define several tautological divisors on $\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}$ by using ω and the intersection theory.

1. The *kappa class* is $\kappa = \pi_*(c_1^2(\omega))$. This definition is different from κ_1 in [AC99].
2. For $1 \le i \le n$, let $\mathbb{L}_i$ be the line bundle on $\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}$, whose fiber over $(C, s_1, s_2, \cdots, s_n)$ is $\Omega_C|_{s_i}$, a cotangent space at s_i in C. The i-th *psi class* is $\psi_i = c_1(\mathbb{L}_i)$. In terms of the intersection theory, $\psi_i = \pi_*(\omega \cdot \sigma_i) = \pi_*(-\sigma_i^2)$. The *total psi class* is $\psi = \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_i$.
3. The boundary of curves with coincident sections $D_{\{i,j\}}$ is equal to $\pi_*(\sigma_i \cdot \sigma_j)$.

We focus on the genus zero case only, so the *lambda class* $\lambda = c_1(\pi_*(\omega))$ is zero.

Next, consider the push-forwards and pull-backs of several divisors.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}} : \overline{M}_{0,n} \to \overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}$ be the reduction morphism.*

1. $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(K_{\overline{M}_{0,n}}) = K_{\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}}$.
2. $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\psi_i) = \psi_i + \sum_{\substack{j \ne i \\ a_i + a_j \le 1}} D_{\{i,j\}}$.
3. $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}}^*(\psi_i) = \psi_i - \sum_{\substack{i \in I \\ w_I \le 1}} D_I$.

Proof. Since the discrepancy is supported on the exceptional locus, item (1) follows immediately. Item (2) and (3) are more careful observations of the proof of [FS08, Lemma 2.4] and [FS08, Lemma 2.8] respectively. Item (3) is also a corollary of cumbersome computation using Lemma 2.2 and [FG03, Lemma 3.1]. □

For $I = \{i_1, \cdots, i_r\} \subset [n]$, let D_I be a boundary of nodal curves. Set $I^c = \{j_1, \cdots, j_s\}$. Then D_I is isomorphic to $\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}_I} \times \overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}_{I^c}}$ where $\mathcal{A}_I = (a_{i_1}, \cdots, a_{i_r}, 1)$ and $\mathcal{A}_{I^c} = (a_{j_1}, \cdots, a_{j_s}, 1)$. Let $\eta_I : \overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}_I} \times \overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}_J} \to D_I \hookrightarrow \overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}$ be the inclusion morphism. Define π_i for $i = 1, 2$ as the projection from $\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}_I} \times \overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}_J}$ to the i-th component.

Lemma 2.4. *Let $\eta_I : \overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}_I} \times \overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}_J} \to D_I \hookrightarrow \overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}$ be the inclusion morphism. Let p (resp. q) denote the last index of $\mathcal{A}_I$ (resp. $\mathcal{A}_J$) with weight one.*

1. $\eta_I^*(\kappa) = \pi_1^*(\kappa + \psi_p) + \pi_2^*(\kappa + \psi_q)$.
2. $\eta_I^*(\psi_i) = \begin{cases} \pi_1^*(\psi_i), & i \in I \\ \pi_2^*(\psi_i), & i \in I^c. \end{cases}$
3. *For $J \subset [n]$, suppose that D_J be a boundary of nodal curves.*

$$\eta_I^*(D_J) = \begin{cases} \pi_1^*(D_J), & J \subsetneq I \\ \pi_2^*(D_J), & J \subsetneq I^c \\ \pi_1^*(\psi_p) + \pi_2^*(\psi_q), & J = I \\ 0, & \textit{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

(4) *Suppose that* $a_i + a_j \le 1$.

$$\eta_I^*(D_{\{i,j\}}) = \begin{cases} \pi_1^*(D_{\{i,j\}}), & i, j \in I \\ \pi_2^*(D_{\{i,j\}}), & i, j \in I^c \\ 0, & \textit{otherwise}. \end{cases}$$

Proof. The proof of these items are essentially identical to the case of $\overline{M}_{0,n}$. Item (1) is in [AC96, Section 1]. Items (2), (4) are clear. The only non obvious part of item (3) is due to [HM98, Proposition 3.31]. □

Let $J \subset [n]$ be a *maximal* subset of $[n]$ such that $\sum_{j\in J} a_j \le 1$. Let $\mathcal{A}'$ be the new weight data obtained by replacing weights indexed by J by one weight $\sum_{j\in J} a_j$. Then the locus of $\sigma_i = \sigma_j$ for all $i, j \in J$ is isomorphic to $\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}'}$ because we can replace sections $\{\sigma_j\}_{j\in J}$ by one section with weight $\sum_{j\in J} a_j$. Let $\chi_J : \overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}'} \to \overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}$ be the replacement morphism.

Lemma 2.5. *Let* $\chi_J : \overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}'} \to \overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}$ *be the replace morphism. Let* p *denote the unique index of* $\mathcal{A}'$ *replacing indices in* J.

(1) $\chi_J^*(\psi_i) = \begin{cases} \psi_i, & i \notin J \\ \psi_p, & i \in J. \end{cases}$

(2) $\chi_J^*(D_{\mathrm{nod}}) = D_{\mathrm{nod}}$.

(3) *Suppose that* $D_{\{i,j\}}$ *is a boundary of curves with coincident sections.*

$$\chi_J^*(D_{\{i,j\}}) = \begin{cases} D_{\{i,j\}}, & i, j \notin J \\ D_{\{i,p\}}, & i \notin J, j \in J \\ -\psi_p, & i, j \in J. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Essentially this is a restatement of [FS08, Lemma 2.9]. □

Finally, let us recall the canonical divisor of $\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}$. The follwing formula is a consequence of Hassett's computation of the canonical divisor and the weighted version of Mumford's relation $\kappa = -D_{\mathrm{nod}}$ ([AC99, (3.15)]).

Lemma 2.6.

$$K_{\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}} = -2D_{\mathrm{nod}} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \psi_i = 2\kappa + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \psi_i. \tag{3}$$

Proof. By [Has03, Section 3.3.1],

$$K_{\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}} = \frac{13}{12}\kappa - \frac{11}{12}D_{\mathrm{nod}} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \psi_i. \tag{4}$$

By the ordinary Mumford's relation $\kappa = -D_{\mathrm{nod}}$ on $\overline{M}_{0,n}$, $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(D_{\mathrm{nod}}) = D_{\mathrm{nod}} + D_{\mathrm{sec}}$ and Lemma 2.3, it is straightforward to check

$$K_{\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}} = \varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(K_{\overline{M}_{0,n}}) = \varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\frac{13}{12}\kappa - \frac{11}{12}D_{\mathrm{nod}} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \psi_i) = -2D_{\mathrm{nod}} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \psi_i.$$

Thus $\kappa = -D_{\mathrm{nod}}$ on $\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}$ too. Substitute it to the right side of (4), we get the above formula. □

3. PROOF OF THEOREMS

In this section, we prove our main theorem. Through this section, we will assume $n \geq 4$. If $n = 3$, then $\overline{M}_{0,3}$ is a point, so there is nothing to prove.

Theorem 3.1. *Let* $\mathcal{A} = (a_1, a_2, \cdots, a_n)$ *be a weight datum. Then the log canonical model* $\overline{M}_{0,n}(K_{\overline{M}_{0,n}} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i\psi_i)$ *is isomorphic to* $\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}$.

Proof. Fix a weight datum $\mathcal{A} = (a_1, a_2, \cdots, a_n)$. Let $\Delta_{\mathcal{A}} = K_{\overline{M}_{0,n}} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i\psi_i$. Set $C = \{I \subset [n] | w_I = \sum_{i\in I} a_i \leq 1, 2 \leq |I| \leq n-2\}$. By Lemma 2.3 and 2.6, it is straightforward to check that

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}}) &= K_{\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i\psi_i + \sum_{\substack{i<j\\ a_i+a_j\leq 1}} (a_i+a_j)D_{\{i,j\}}\\ &= -2D_{\text{nod}} + \sum_{i=1}^{n}(1+a_i)\psi_i + \sum_{\substack{i<j\\ a_i+a_j\leq 1}} (a_i+a_j)D_{\{i,j\}}.\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

By Lemma 2.2 and 2.3,

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_{\mathcal{A}}^{*}\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}}) &= -2D_{\text{nod}} + 2\sum_{I\in C} D_I + \sum_{i=1}^{n}(1+a_i)\psi_i - \sum_{I\in C}(|I| + w_I)D_I\\ &\quad + \sum_{\substack{i<j\\ a_i+a_j}} (a_i+a_j)D_{\{i,j\}} + \sum_{\substack{I\in C\\ |I|\geq 3}}(|I|-1)w_I D_I\\ &= -2D_{\text{nod}} + \sum_{i=1}^{n}(1+a_i)\psi_i + \sum_{I\in C}(|I|-2)(w_I-1)D_I.\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

So

$$\Delta_{\mathcal{A}} - \varphi_{\mathcal{A}}^{*}\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}}) = \sum_{I\in C}(|I|-2)(1-w_I)D_I. \tag{7}$$

Note that for every $I \in C$, $|I| \geq 2$ and $w_I \leq 1$ by the definition of C. So the difference $\Delta_{\mathcal{A}} - \varphi_{\mathcal{A}}^{*}\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}})$ is supported on the exceptional locus of $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}}$ and effective. This implies that

$$H^0(\overline{M}_{0,n}, \Delta_{\mathcal{A}}) \cong H^0(\overline{M}_{0,n}, \varphi_{\mathcal{A}}^{*}\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}})) \cong H^0(\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}, \varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}}))$$

by [Deb01, Lemma 7.11]. The same statement holds for a positive multiple of $\Delta_{\mathcal{A}}$, too. Therefore from the definition of the log canonical model, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{M}_{0,n}(K_{\overline{M}_{0,n}} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i\psi_i) &= \operatorname{Proj}\left(\bigoplus_{l\geq 0} H^0(\overline{M}_{0,n}, \mathcal{O}(l\Delta_{\mathcal{A}}))\right)\\ &= \operatorname{Proj}\left(\bigoplus_{l\geq 0} H^0(\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}, \mathcal{O}(l\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}})))\right).\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

If we prove $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}})$ is ample, then the last birational model is exactly $\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}$. So to prove the main theorem, it suffices to show that $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}})$ is ample on $\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}$. This is done in Proposition 3.2 and 3.5. □

Proposition 3.2. *Let* $\mathcal{A} = (a_1, \cdots, a_n)$ *be a weight datum and let* $\Delta_{\mathcal{A}} = K_{\overline{M}_{0,n}} + \sum_{i=1}^n a_i\psi_i$. *Then for the reduction morphism* $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}} : \overline{M}_{0,n} \to \overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}$, $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}})$ *is a nef divisor on* $\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}$.

The key ingredient is the following positivity result of Fedorchuk [Fed10]. Fedorchuk gives an elementary and beautiful intersection theoretical proof of this result. As Fedorchuk mentioned in [Fed10], it can be proved by using the semipositivity method of Kollár in [Kol90, Corollary 4.6, Proposition 4.7].

Proposition 3.3. [Fed10, Proposition 2.1] *Let* $\pi : S \to B$ *be a generically smooth family of nodal curves of arithmetic genus* g, *with* n *sections* $\sigma_1, \cdots, \sigma_n$ *over a smooth complete curve* B. *For a weight datum* $\mathcal{A} = (a_1, \cdots, a_n)$, *suppose that*

$$L := \omega_\pi + \sum_{i=1}^n a_i\sigma_i$$

is π*-nef. Suppose further that* $\sigma_{i_1}, \cdots, \sigma_{i_k}$ *can coincide only if* $\sum_j \sigma_{i_j} \le 1$. *Then* L *is nef on* S.

If $\pi : S \to B$ is a generically smooth family of $\mathcal{A}$-stable curves, or more generally $\mathcal{A}$-semi-stable curves (allowing irreducible components with 2 nodes and no marked points), then the assumptions of Proposition 3.3 is satisfied by the definition of $\mathcal{A}$-stablility.

We need an effectivity result first.

Lemma 3.4. *Let* $\pi : S \to B$ *be a family of* $\mathcal{A}$*-stable curves with* n *sections* $\sigma_1, \cdots, \sigma_n$ *over a smooth complete curve* B. *Then* $2\omega_\pi + \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i$ *is effective.*

Proof. We will use induction on n. For $n = 4$ case, the result is a direct computation.

By [HM98, 118p], S has at worst A_k singularities only. An A_k singularity is Du Val, so if $\rho : \tilde{S} \to S$ is a minimal resolution, then $\omega_{\pi\circ\rho} = \rho^*(\omega_\pi)$ and $\rho_*(\omega_{\pi\circ\rho}) = \omega_\rho$. Thus we may assume that S is smooth.

Suppose that for $J \subset [n]$ with $|J| \ge 2$, $\sigma_i = \sigma_j$ for all $i, j \in J$. We may assume that $J = \{1, 2, \cdots, m\}$ for some $m \le n$. Then by pull-back along $\chi_J : \overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}'} \to \overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}$ (see Section 2.2), we may assume that $(\pi : S \to B, \sigma_1, \cdots, \sigma_n)$ is a family of $\mathcal{A}'$-stable curves $(\pi : S \to B, \sigma_m, \sigma_{m+1}, \cdots, \sigma_n)$ with $|J| - 1$ additional sections $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \cdots, \sigma_{m-1}$. By the induction hypothesis, $2\omega_\pi + \sum_{i=m}^n \sigma_i$ is effective. So $2\omega_\pi + \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i = (2\omega_\pi + \sum_{i=m}^n \sigma_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \sigma_i$ is effective, too. Thus we may assume that all sections are distinct.

After taking several blow-ups along points with two or more sections meet, we get a family of $(1, 1, \cdots, 1)$-semi-stable curves $(\pi_1 : S_1 \to B, \sigma_1^1, \cdots, \sigma_n^1)$. Let $\rho_1 : S_1 \to S$ be the blow-up. If there exist (-1) curves with exactly 2 sections, after contracting these (-1) curves by blowing-down, we get a family $(\pi_2 : S_2 \to B, \sigma_1^2, \cdots, \sigma_n^2)$ of $(1/2, \cdots, 1/2)$-semi-stable curves. Let $\rho_2 : S_1 \to S_2$ be the blow-down morphism. Over S_2, $2\omega_{\pi_2} + \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^2$ is nef by Proposition 3.3 and thus effective.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
& S_1 \arrow[ld, "\rho_1"'] \arrow[rd, "\rho_2"] \arrow[dd, "\pi_1"] & \\
S \arrow[rd, "\pi"'] & & S_2 \arrow[ld, "\pi_2"] \\
& B &
\end{tikzcd} \tag{9}$$

From $(1/2, \cdots, 1/2)$-stability, we know that for each point in S_2, at most two sections meet at that point. Let $x_1, \cdots, x_k$ be points with coincident sections. Then ρ_2 is the blow-up along $x_1, \cdots, x_k$. Let $E_1, \cdots, E_k$ be the exceptional divisors. By the blow-up formula, $\omega_{\pi_1} = \rho_2^*(\omega_{\pi_2}) + \sum_{j=1}^k E_j$. Also $\sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^1 = \rho_2^*(\sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^2) - 2\sum_{j=1}^k E_j$. Thus

$$2\omega_{\pi_1} + \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^1 = \rho_2^*(2\omega_{\pi_2} + \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^2), \tag{10}$$

so $2\omega_{\pi_1} + \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^1$ is effective.

Finally, $\rho_{1*}(\omega_{\pi_1}) = \omega_\pi$ and $\rho_{1*}(\sigma_i^1) = \sigma_i$ since ρ_1 is a composition of point blow-ups. Thus $2\omega_\pi + \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i = \rho_{1*}(2\omega_{\pi_1} + \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^1)$ is a push-forward of an effective divisor. Hence it is effective, too. ☐

Proof of Proposition 3.2. For $n = 4$ case, since $\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}} \cong \overline{M}_{0,n} \cong \mathbb{P}^1$, the result is a consequence of a simple direct computation. So we can use the induction on the dimension n.

To prove the nefness of $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}})$, it suffices to show that for every complete irreducible curve $B \to \overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}$, the restriction of $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}})|_B$ has nonnegative degree. By composing the normalization $B^\nu \to B$, we may assume that B is smooth.

By equation (5) and $\kappa = -D_{\mathrm{nod}}$ (see the proof of Lemma 2.6), it is straightforward to check that

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}}) &= 2\kappa + \sum_{i=1}^n (1+a_i)\psi_i + \sum_{\substack{i<j \\ a_i+a_j \le 1}} (a_i+a_j) D_{\{i,j\}} \qquad (11)\\
&= \pi_*\Big(2\omega^2 + \sum_{i=1}^n (1+a_i)(\omega \cdot \sigma_i) + \sum_{\substack{i<j \\ a_i+a_j \le 1}} (a_i+a_j)(\sigma_i \cdot \sigma_j)\Big). \qquad (12)
\end{aligned}$$

For a boundary divisor D_I of nodal curves, let $\eta_I : \overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}_I} \times \overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}_{I^c}} \to D_I \hookrightarrow \overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}$ be the inclusion of boundary. We will use the same notation in Section 2.2. By Lemma 2.4 and (11), it is straightforward to check

$$\eta_I^*(\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}})) = \pi_1^*(\varphi_{\mathcal{A}_I*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}_I})) + \pi_2^*(\varphi_{\mathcal{A}_{I^c}*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}_{I^c}})). \tag{13}$$

Thus for a curve B supported on a boundary, the degree of $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}})$ is non-negative by induction. Therefore it suffices to check for a family $S \to B$ whose general fiber is a nonsingular curve.

Note that $\omega \cdot \sigma_i = -\sigma_i^2$ by adjunction formula and $\sigma_i \cdot \sigma_j = 0$ if $a_i + a_j > 1$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} & 2\omega^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} (1 + a_i)(\omega \cdot \sigma_i) + \sum_{\substack{i<j \\ a_i+a_j \le 1}} (a_i + a_j)(\sigma_i \cdot \sigma_j) \\ & = 2\omega^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\omega \cdot \sigma_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} 2a_i(\omega \cdot \sigma_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i\sigma_i^2 + \sum_{i<j} (a_i + a_j)(\sigma_i \cdot \sigma_j) \\ & = (\omega + \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i\sigma_i) \cdot (2\omega + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sigma_i). \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Hence it suffices to check that $\deg \pi_*\big((\omega + \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i\sigma_i) \cdot (2\omega + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sigma_i)\big)|_B \geq 0$. By Proposition 3.3, $\omega + \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i\sigma_i$ is nef on S. By Lemma 3.4, $2\omega + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sigma_i$ is effective on S. Thus the intersection is non-negative and the result follows. ☐

Next, we prove the ampleness of $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}})$. This is an application of the perturbation technique of Fedorchuk and Smyth introduced in [FS08].

Proposition 3.5. *Within the same assumption of Proposition 3.2, $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}})$ is an ample divisor on $\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}$.*

Proof. We will prove that the following statement: For $\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}$, there exists $\epsilon_{\mathcal{A}} > 0$ such that $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}}) \cdot B \geq \epsilon_{\mathcal{A}}$ for every irreducible curve class B. This implies that $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}})$ lies on the interior of $\mathrm{Nef}(\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}})$, so by Kleiman's criterion, $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}})$ is ample.

We will use the induction on n. When $n = 4$, then $\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}} \cong \mathbb{P}^1$ and the result is straightforward.

Let B be an integral complete curve on $\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}$. Since we only consider the intersection numbers only, we may assume B is nonsingular by applying normalization. We will divide into three cases:

(1) B is in a component of nodal boundary.

By (13) and the induction hypothesis, when we restrict $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}})$ to a component of boundary of nodal curves, the restriction is ample and there is a lower bound of intersection numbers.

(2) A general point of B parameterizes smooth curve and there exist $J \subset [n]$ with $|J| \geq 2$ such that $\sigma_i = \sigma_j$ for all $i, j \in J$ and $\sigma_i^2 < 0$.

We may assume that J is maximal among such subsets. In this case, B is contained in the image of $\chi_J : \overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}'} \to \overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}$ defined in section 2.2. Let p be the unique index of

$\mathcal{A}'$ replacing indices in J. Then by (5) and Lemma 2.5,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\chi_J^*(\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}})) &= \chi_J^*\Big(-2D_{\mathrm{nod}} + \sum_{i=1}^{n}(1+a_i)\psi_i + \sum_{\substack{i<j\\ a_i+a_j\le 1}}(a_i+a_j)D_{\{i,j\}}\Big)\\
&= -2D_{\mathrm{nod}} + \sum_{i\in J^c}(1+a_i)\psi_i + \sum_{i\in J}(1+a_i)\psi_p + \sum_{i<j,\ i,j\in J^c}(a_i+a_j)D_{\{i,j\}}\\
&\quad + \sum_{i\in J,\ j\in J^c}(a_i+a_j)D_{\{p,j\}} - \sum_{i<j,\ i,j\in J}(a_i+a_j)\psi_p\\
&= -2D_{\mathrm{nod}} + \sum_{i\in J^c}(1+a_i)\psi_i + (1+\sum_{j\in J}a_j)\psi_p + (|J|-1)\psi_p + \sum_{i<j,\ i,j\in J^c}(a_i+a_j)D_{\{i,j\}}\\
&\quad + \sum_{j\in J^c}\Big((\sum_{i\in J}a_i)+a_j\Big)D_{\{p,j\}} + (|J|-1)\sum_{j\in J^c}a_jD_{\{p,j\}} - (|J|-1)\Big(\sum_{i\in J}a_i\Big)\psi_p\\
&= \varphi_{\mathcal{A}'*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}'}) + (|J|-1)\Big((1-\sum_{i\in J}a_i)\psi_p + \sum_{j\in J^c}a_jD_{\{p,j\}}\Big).
\end{aligned}
\tag{15}
$$

By induction hypothesis, $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}'*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}'})\cdot B$ is bounded below by a positive number. Since $\sigma_p^2 < 0$ by assumption, $\psi_p = -\sigma_p^2 > 0$ on B. The last summand is nonnegative since $D_{\{p,i\}}$ does not cover whole B because of the maximality of J. Hence there exists a positive lower bound of the intersection number $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}})\cdot B$.

Remark 3.6. Indeed, the term $(1-\sum_{i\in J}a_i)\psi_p + \sum_{j\in J^c}a_jD_{\{p.j\}}$ in the last row of (15) is C_p in [Fed10, Theorem 1]. Fedorchuk proved that C_p is nef on $\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}$.

(3) Otherwise.

In this case, a general point of B parameterizes a smooth curve. Note that there exists $\delta > 0$ such that every $\mathcal{A} = (a_1, a_2, \cdots, a_n)$-stable curve is also $\mathcal{A}_1 = (a_1-\delta, a_2-\delta, \cdots, a_n-\delta)$-stable too. Therefore $\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}} = \overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}_1}$ and $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}} = \varphi_{\mathcal{A}_1}$, so $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}_1})$ is nef by Proposition 3.2. Thus

$$
\begin{aligned}
\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}}) &= \varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(K_{\overline{M}_{0,n}} + \sum_{i=1}^{n}a_i\psi_i)\\
&= \varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(K_{\overline{M}_{0,n}} + \sum_{i=1}^{n}(a_i-\delta)\psi_i) + \delta\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\psi) = \varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}_1}) + \delta\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\psi).
\end{aligned}
$$

On $\overline{M}_{0,n}$, $\psi = \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor n/2\rfloor}\frac{j(n-j)}{n-1}D_j$ by [FG03, Lemma 1]. Thus $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}})$ is a sum of a nef divisor $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}_1})$ and an effective divisor $\delta\varphi_{\mathcal{A}}(\psi)+P$ supported on the boundary. Note that ψ and $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\psi)$ are *positive* linear combinations of *all* boundary components. So if we take a divisor P with small coefficients with respect to boundary divisors, then $\delta\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\psi) + P$ is an effective sum of boundary divisors.

We claim that $(\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}}) + P)\cdot B$ is nonnegative. Since B does not lie on nodal boundary divisors, $D_I\cdot B \geq 0$ for all boundary divisors of nodal curves. Also, since B has no coincident sections with negative self intersections, $D_I \cdot B \geq 0$ for all divisors of coincident sections, too. Therefore B intersects non-negatively with $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}}) + P$. So for any metric $\|\cdot\|$ on $N^1(\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}})$, there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that if $\|P\| < \alpha$, then $(\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}})+P)\cdot B \geq 0$ for every irreducible curve B. Note that α depends on only δ, but not on B. Thus there exists a positive lower bound of the intersection number $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}}) \cdot B$.

Note that there exists only *finitely many* strata on $\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}$. So there exists only finitely many positive lower bounds of $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}}) \cdot B$ with respect to each stratum. After taking the minimum, we get the global positive lower bound $\epsilon_{\mathcal{A}}$ of intersection numbers. ☐

Remark 3.7. Theorem 3.1 shows an unexpected duality. Let $(C, x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_n)$ be a stable pointed rational curve. Then the log canonical model $C(\omega_C + \sum a_i x_i)$ is an $\mathcal{A}$-stable curve. More precisely, it is $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}}(C, x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_n)$. The same weight datum determines the log canonical model $\overline{M}_{0,n}(K_{\overline{M}_{0,n}} + \sum a_i \psi_i)$.

Remark 3.8. Suppose that the weight datum $\mathcal{A} = (a_1, \cdots, a_n)$ is symmetric, i.e, $a_1 = \cdots = a_n = \alpha$ for some $2/n < \alpha \leq 1$. Then by [FG03, Lemma 1] and [Pan97, Proposition 2],

$$\psi = \sum_{j=2}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} \frac{j(n-j)}{n-1} D_j = K_{\overline{M}_{0,n}} + 2D. \tag{16}$$

So for $\alpha > 0$,

$$K_{\overline{M}_{0,n}} + \alpha\psi = (1+\alpha)(K_{\overline{M}_{0,n}} + \frac{2\alpha}{1+\alpha} D). \tag{17}$$

Therefore the log canonical model of the pair $(\overline{M}_{0,n}, K_{\overline{M}_{0,n}} + \alpha\psi)$ is equal to the log canonical model of the pair $(\overline{M}_{0,n}, K_{\overline{M}_{0,n}} + \frac{2\alpha}{1+\alpha} D)$. If we substitute $\beta = \frac{2\alpha}{1+\alpha}$, then we get Theorem 1.2. Hence it is a generalization of Simpson's theorem (Theorem 1.2).

Remark 3.9. A divisor Δ on $\overline{M}_{0,n}$ is called *log canonical* if

$$\Delta \equiv r(K_{\overline{M}_{0,n}} + \sum_{i \subset [n], 2 \leq |I| \leq n-2} c_I D_I) \tag{18}$$

for some $r > 0$ and $0 \leq c_I \leq 1$ [AGS10, Definition 6.2]. For a log canonical divisor Δ, it is nef if and only if Δ intersects with vital curves nonnegatively ([FG03, Theorem 5]). So if $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}}^* \varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}})$ in (6) is log canonical, then the proof in [Mo10] is sufficient. But for some weight data, $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}}^* \varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}})$ is not log canonical. For example, if $n = 10$ and $\mathcal{A} = (1, 1, \epsilon, \epsilon, \cdots, \epsilon)$ for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, then by using computer algebra system, we can check that $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}}^* \varphi_{\mathcal{A}*}(\Delta_{\mathcal{A}})$ is not log canonical. So for a complete proof, we need the argument in this paper.

REFERENCES

[AGS10] V. Alexeev, A. Gibney and D. Swinarski. *Conformal blocks divisors on $\overline{M}_{0,n}$ from sl_2*. arXiv:1011.6659. 12

[AS08] V. Alexeev and D. Swinarski. *Nef divisors on $\overline{M}_{0,n}$ from GIT.* arXiv:0812.0778. 1, 2

[AC96] E. Arbarello and M. Cornalba. *Combinatorial and algebro-geometric cohomology classes on the moduli spaces of curves.* J. Algebraic Geom. 5 (1996), no. 4, 705–749. 4, 6

[AC99] E. Arbarello and M. Cornalba. *Calculating cohomology groups of moduli spaces of curves via algebraic geometry.* Inst. Hautes tudes Sci. Publ. Math. No. 88 (1998), 97–127 (1999). 4, 5, 6

[Deb01] O. Debarre. *Higher-dimensional algebraic geometry.* Universitext. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2001. 2, 7

[FG03] G. Farkas and A. Gibney. *The Mori cones of moduli spaces of pointed curves of small genus.* Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 355 (2003), no. 3, 1183–1199. 5, 11, 12

[Fed10] M. Fedorchuk. *Moduli spaces of weighted stable curves and log canonical models of* $\bar{M}_{g,n}$. arXiv:1004.4938. 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 11

[FS08] M. Fedorchuk and D. Smyth. *Ample divisors on moduli spaces of pointed rational curves.* to appear in J. Algebraic Geom., arXiv:0810.1677. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 10

[GS10] N. Giansiracusa and M. Simpson. *GIT Compactifications of* $\overline{M}_{0,n}$ *from Conics.* to appear in Internat. Math. Res. Notices. arXiv:1001.2830. 1

[HM98] J. Harris and I. Morrison. *Moduli of curves.* Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 187. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1998. 4, 6, 8

[Has03] B. Hassett. *Moduli spaces of weighted pointed stable curves.* Adv. Math. 173 (2003), no. 2, 316–352. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6

[HK00] Y. Hu and S. Keel. *Mori dream spaces and GIT.* Michigan Math. J. 48 (2000), 331–348. 1

[Kap93] M. Kapranov. *Chow quotients of Grassmannians. I.* I. M. Gelfand Seminar, 29–110, Adv. Soviet Math., 16, Part 2, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1993. 1

[Ke92] S. Keel. *Intersection theory of moduli space of stable n-pointed curves of genus zero.* Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 330 (1992), no. 2, 545–574. 1, 3, 4

[KMc96] S. Keel and J. McKernan. *Contractible extreamal rays on* $\overline{M}_{0,n}$. arXiv:9607009. 1

[KM10] Y.-H. Kiem and H.-B. Moon. *Moduli spaces of weighted pointed stable rational curves via GIT.* arXiv:1002.2461. 1, 2, 4

[Kol90] J. Kollár. *Projectivity of complete moduli.* J. Differential Geom. 32 (1990), no. 1, 235–268. 8

[Knu83] F. Knudsen. *The projectivity of the moduli space of stable curves. II. The stacks* $M_{g,n}$. Math. Scand. 52 (1983), no. 2, 161–199. 1

[Mo10] H.-B. Moon. *Mori's program for the moduli spaces of pointed stable rational curves.* arXiv:1011.3926. 2, 3, 12

[Mo11] H.-B. Moon. *Birational geometry of moduli spaces of curves of genus zero.* in preparation. 4

[Pan97] R. Pandharipande, *The canonical class of* $\overline{M}_{0,n}(\mathbb{P}^r, d)$. Internat. Math. Res. Notices 1997, no. 4, 173–186. 12

[Sim07] M. Simpson. *On Log canonical models of the moduli space of stable pointed curves.* arXiv:0709.4037. 1, 2

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SEOUL NATIONAL UNIVERSITY, SEOUL 151-747, KOREA

E-mail address: `spring-1@snu.ac.kr`